

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Leroy Griffin, #33202-171, |) | |
| a/k/a Leroy Anthony Griffin, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | C.A. No. 4:20-3241-HMH-TER |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | OPINION & ORDER |
| |) | |
| Sherri Buddin, |) | |
| Sgt. Mrs. Reid, |) | |
| Lt. Moyd, |) | |
| Sgt. Jitt Wilson, |) | |
| Sgt. Rico Ravenell, |) | |
| Lt. Mr. Linbury, |) | |
| Lt. Lavoia Ceasar, |) | |
| Corp. Ms. Pressley, |) | |
| Ofc. Ohio Duke, |) | |
| Lt. Mr. Courtney, |) | |
| Ofc. Jada Fulton, |) | |
| Ofc. Laquisha Strong, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Leroy Griffin (“Plaintiff”), a current federal prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of his civil rights while a pretrial detainee at Williamsburg County Detention Center. In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends partial dismissal of the complaint

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

without prejudice and without issuance and service of process as to certain claims and defendants. (R&R, generally, ECF No. 21.)

Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Plaintiff's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Accordingly, after review, the court finds that Plaintiff's objections are without merit. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Rogers' Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

It is therefore

ORDERED that the complaint is partially dismissed in accordance with the Report and Recommendation. It is further

ORDERED that Defendants Buddin, Fulton, and Ceasar are summarily dismissed with prejudice and without issuance and service of process. It is further

ORDERED that all of Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Wilson, Reid, Duke, Strong, Moyd, Courtney, Linburg, Ravenell, and Pressley are dismissed, with the exception of his

religious accommodation claims, as more fully set out in the Report and Recommendation. It is further

ORDERED that this matter is referred to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
December 14, 2020

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.